R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 002 814 24

RELATIONSHIP OF SCHOOL EXPERIENCES TO REPEATED DELINQUENCY AMONG BOYS WITH INTELLIGENCE IN THE BOTTON FIFTH OF THE POPULATION.

BY- WATTENBERG, WILLIAM W.
WAYNE STATE UNIV., DETROIT, MICH.

REPORT NUMBER CRP-201 PUB DATE 30 APR 60
CONTRACT OEC-SAE-7155
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.84 46P.

DESCRIPTORS- MALES, *DELINQUENCY PREVENTION, *EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE, POLICE ACTION, *STUDENT TEACHER RELATIONSHIP, SOCIAL RELATIONS, LOW ACHIEVERS, POLICE SCHOOL RELATIONSHIP, *ACADEMIC FAILURE, DETROIT, MICHIGAN

THE BASIC PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY WAS TO DETERMINE WHAT SCHOOL EXPERIENCES ARE LINKED TO REPEATED DELINQUENCY AMONG BOYS WHOSE MENTAL TEST SCORES PLACED THEM IN THE LOWEST 20 PERCENT OF THE POPULATION. A SECOND OBJECTIVE WAS TO DETERMINE THE EXTENT TO WHICH SCHOOL ACCOMPLISHMENT OPERATES AS A PREDICTOR OF RECIDIVISM AMONG BOYS OF BELOW-AVERAGE INTELLIGENCE AS COMPARED WITH BOYS OF AVERAGE INTELLIGENCE. THIS STUDY CONSISTED OF TWO PHASES. IN THE FIRST PHASE OF THE STUDY, THE FINDINGS WERE SUGGESTIVE OF A PATTERN OF RELATIVE INCOMPETENCE LINKED TO THE DELINQUENCY OF BOYS HAVING LOW MENTAL TEST SCORES. THERE WAS SOME SIMILARITY TO THE PERSONALITY SYNDROME, PSYCHIATRICALLY DENOTED AS "INADEQUATE PERSONALITY." IN THE SECOND PHASE, THE FINDINGS WERE ABLE TO PROBE INTO THE EXPERIENCES AND ATTITUDES OF BOYS MATCHED ON CONFORMITY TO THE ABOVE PATTERN. THE KEY FACTORS WERE NOT CONNECTED MARKEDLY WITH ACADEMIC WORK. IN THAT AREA THE EXPERIENCES OF BOTH THE REPEATER AND NONREPEATER WERE UNIFORMLY UNSATISFACTORY. THE INVESTIGATOR RECOMMENDS MORE STUDY IN THE AREA OF SOCIAL PREDICTION, FULL-SCALE PSYCHOTHERAPEUTIC INTERVENTION, AND MORE CLASSROOM-APPROPRIATE METHODS FOR AIDING SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT TO MINIMIZE WHAT WAS THE CONCLUSION OF THIS REPORT--THAT LOW MENTAL SCORES ARE COUPLED WITH INTERPERSONAL DIFFICULTIES IN SCHOOL. (JL)

ED002814

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROJECT No. 201
(Contract Number-SAE 7155)

RELATIONSHIP OF SCHOOL EXPERIENCES TO REPEATED DELINQUENCY AMONG BOYS WITH INTELLIGENCE IN THE BOTTOM FIFTH OF THE POPULATION

Prinicpal Investigator: William W. Wattenberg, Ph.D.
Wayne State University
1960

CONTRACT NUMBER - SAE 7155

SUMMARY OF FINAL REPORT

This study of school experiences linked to delinquency involved two phases. In the first, statistical data derived from police reports and school records of 1,262 boys first contacted by Detroit police in 1954 were analyzed to discover what factors were linked to repeating among boys with mental test scores placing them in the lowest quintile of the population.

The pattern which emerged from this study found repeating more prevalent when the boy preferred social to solitary sources of entertainment, expressed indifference to school, reported poor grades, and had parents who, when he was in trouble, were either indifferent or sought to alibi themselves.

In the second phase of the study, 25 repeaters and 25 non-repeaters were matched on conformity to the pattern outlined above. Each boy was interviewed to determine his perception of his school experiences; special emphasis was placed on his memories of school in 1954. Then, the teacher who had had this boy in homeroom in 1954 wa located and interviewed to secure data on his or her perceptions of the boy.

In general the interviews of both the teachers and the boys were in accord. Although all concerned reported that the boys had encountered substantial scholastic difficulties, this fact did not distinguish between repeaters and non-repeaters. Rather, the differentiating items related largely to interpersonal difficulties.

It should be pointed out that the evidence furnished by the boys in their interviews runs counter to the stereotyped assumption that humorless and ruthless pedagogues drive many boys to delinquency by failing to allow for academic disabilities. Almost every boy reported incidents in which friendly teachers went out of their way to aid him in overcoming difficulties. The prevalence of such helpful attitudes would indicate a readiness for further improvement.

The results of this study would point to the importance of determining to what extent the poor social relationships in school were causal to the delinquency and to what extent they are merely symptomatic of deeper difficulties. Pending such determination it would appear useful as a delinquency prevention measure, to see to what extent teachers can help boys of low intellectual ability to conquer any social difficulties which may arise in school.

William W. Wattenberg

William W. Wattenberg
Wayne State University
Detroit 2, Michigan

April 30, 1960

3414 ✓
229

CONTRACT NUMBER - SAE 7155

FINAL REPORT

The purpose of this study was to discover what school experiences were linked to repeated delinquency among boys with mental test scores placing them in the lowest twenty per cent of the population. The study involved two phases. In the first, an analysis of data derived from police reports on 1,262 boys was made with the aim of discovering what facts were associated with repeating among boys with low mental test scores. In the second phase, two groups of boys (and their teachers) equated on the factors discovered in the first phase were interviewed to find what items in their school experiences distinguished repeaters from non-repeaters.

Initial Cooperative Arrangements

The data upon which both phases were based could be obtained only if records and arrangements to interview children and teachers could be made available. Accordingly, permission to use the records in the files of the Youth Bureau was obtained from the Detroit Police Department. Cooperative arrangements for use of school records and for interviewing school personnel and students were completed with the Detroit Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools of the Archdiocese of Detroit. At all stages of the research the key officials of all three cooperating groups were kept aware of what was being done and what was being discovered. No problems arose in this regard.

The First Phase

The basic records used in the first phase were the Detroit Police Department Youth Bureau files on all boys who in 1954 had a police contact which was the first in their records and who were fourteen years of age or younger at the time. There was a total of 1,262 such records.

The police files on these boys were examined, and the boys divided into two groups: (1) those who had at least one subsequent police contact; these were designated as "repeaters"; and (2) those who had but the one initial police contact, designated as "non-repeaters."

For all 1,262 boys, a visit was made to the school which they were attending, according to the police records, in 1954. The school records were inspected for evidence as to mental test scores. For those in Detroit, a group mental test is given routinely in the kindergarten and in the fourth grade. Scores are recorded as letter grades: A, B, C, D, and E. The notations D and E are assigned to those whose scores would place them in the bottom twenty per cent of the population. For boys in parochial schools, a variety of tests were used. Generally, these were recorded as IQ figures. On the basis of the frequency distribution for these scores, each boy was assigned to the appropriate grouping: bottom twenty per cent or the upper eighty per cent.

For a number of boys, inability to locate school records, false information given to police, or loss of records due to transfers, made it necessary to drop them from the study. Those who remained were divided into four groups, with populations as follows:

	Number
Mental test scores in bottom twenty per cent	
Repeaters	279
Non-repeaters	224
Mental test scores in top eighty per cent	
Repeaters	214
Non-repeaters	226

For all of these boys, there was a Youth Bureau "history sheet." This was an information sheet on which certain data were checked by the Youth Bureau patrolman who had contact with each boy. The facts represented information obtained by the officer in the course of interviews with the boy, a visit to his school and his home. This was supplemented by ratings made by the officer. For each item listed below, the data were coded, punched on IBM cards, and thus were available for machine processing.

The itmes recorded were the following:

Item	Classifications
1. Attitude toward police officer.	1a. "Honest" 1b. Evasive 1c. Anti-social 1d. Responsive
2. Attitude toward home.	2a. Likes 2b. Dislikes 2c. Indifferent
3. Physical development.	3a. Robust 3b. Puny 3c. Large for age 3d. Small for age 3e. Average
4. Sexual development.	4a. Pre-adolescent 4b. Early adolescent 4c. Mature
5. Appearance.	5a. Neat and clean 5b. Slovenly 5c. Average 5d. Over-dressed 5e. Eccentric

6. "Type" of youth.	6a. Studious 6b. Quarrelsome 6c. Mischievous 6d. Normal 6e. Effeminate
7. Attitude toward parents.	7a. Likes mother 7b. Likes father 7c. Dislikes mother 7d. Dislikes father 7e. Likes both 7f. Dislikes both 7g. Likes mother; dislikes father 7h. Likes father; dislikes mother 7i. No parents
8. Attitudes toward step-parents.	8a. Likes stepmother 8b. Likes stepfather 8c. Dislikes stepmother 8d. Dislikes stepfather 8e. Likes both 8f. No step-parent
9. Sports and hobbies.	9a. Camping 9b. Sports and games 9c. Mechanics 9d. Dancing 9e. Arts or crafts 9f. Hobbies 9g. Others 9h. None
10. Members of:	10a. Boy Scouts 10b. YMCA 10c. Boys' club 10d. Participates in recreation program 10e. Hobby club 10f. Athletic club 10g. Others 10h. None
11. Church or Sunday School attendance.	11a. Once a week 11b. At least once a month 11c. Less than once a month 11d. Never
12. Type of entertainment preferred.	12a. Shows 12b. Recreation 12c. Amusement park 12d. Dancing 12e. Hobby 12f. Shows and sports 12g. Radio and TV

13. Attitude toward school.	13a. Likes 13b. Dislikes 13c. Indifferent 13d. Hates 13e. Not attending
14. Attitude toward teachers.	14a. Friendly 14b. No comment 14c. Contempt 14d. Antagonism 14e. Not attending school
15. Relations with classmates.	15a. Friendly 15b. Ignored 15c. Quarrels 15d. Shuns 15e. Not attending school
16. School accomplishment.	16a. Good grades 16b. Average grades 16c. Poor grades 16d. Failing grades 16e. Not attending school
17. Paid employment.	17a. Part-time regular 17b. Full time 17c. Odd jobs 17d. None
18. Disposition of earnings.	18a. All to parents 18b. Part to parents 18c. For youth's maintenance 18d. For entertainment 18e. No earnings
19. Chores around home.	19a. Many 19b. Few 19c. Occasional 19d. None
20. Money from parents.	20a. Allowance 20b. Pay for work around home 20c. On request 20d. None
21. Type of employment.	21a. Labor 21b. Office 21c. Paper boy 21d. Errand boy 21e. Odd Jobs 21f. Clerk 21g. Peddler 21h. Usher 21i. Stock boy

22. Relations with other youths.	22a. Lone wolf type 22b. Member of loosely knit crowd 22c. Member of definite group 22d. Member of regular gang
23. Group activities.	23a. Orderly 23b. Rambunctious 23c. Organized destruction of property 23d. Organized theft 23e. Aggressive assaults
24. Recreational equipment.	24a. Less than playmates 24b. Same as playmates 24c. More than playmates
25. Attitude toward adult neighbors.	25a. Friendly 25b. Indifferent 25c. Hostile 25d. Spiteful
26. Type of home.	26a. Single 26b. Flat 26c. Apartment 26d. Rooming house 26e. Hotel 26f. Housing project
27. Size of home (rooms per person).	27a. Less than one room per person 27b. One room per person 27c. More than one room per person
28. Condition of interior	28a. Unduly meticulous 28b. Average 28c. Slovenly
29. Condition of dwelling.	29a. Good 29b. Needs major repairs 29c. Average 29d. Sub-standard 29e. Needs minor repairs
30. Distance from home to nearest recreational facility.	30a. Less than 5 blocks; uses 30b. Less than 5 blocks; doesn't use 30c. Less than 10 blocks; uses 30d. Less than 10 blocks; doesn't use 30e. Less than 20 blocks; uses 30f. Less than 20 blocks; doesn't use

31. Estimated type of neighborhood.	31a. Wealthy 31b. Above average 31c. Average 31d. Little below average 31e. Slum area
32. Environs.	32a. Racially same and business 32b. Racially same and residential 32c. Racially mixed and business 32d. Racially mixed and residential
33. Parents' attitude toward child.	33a. Punitive 33b. Forgiving 33c. Trying to understand 33d. Over-protective 33e. Not wanted in home
34. Parents' attitude toward officer.	34a. Cooperative 34b. Indifferent 34c. Antagonistic 34d. Alibi self 34e. Bossy
35. Employment of parents.	35a. Father employed 35b. Mother employed 35c. Both employed 35d. Neither employed
36. Father's supervision.	36a. Days 36b. Evenings 36c. Nights 36d. All the time 36e. Days and evenings 36f. Days and nights 36g. Evenings and nights 36h. Swing shift 36i. No father in home
37. Mother's supervision.	37a. Days 37b. Evenings 37c. Nights 37d. All the time 37e. Days and evenings 37f. Days and nights 37g. Evenings and nights 37h. No mother in home
38. Income	38a. Poverty 38b. Regular low 38c. Adequate 38d. Wealthy

39. Parents' participation in boys' activities.	39a. Regular 39b. Occasional 39c. Seldom 39d. None
40. Marital status of parents.	40a. Separated 40b. Not separated 40c. Divorced 40d. Mother dead 40e. Father dead 40f. Both dead
41. Do family members quarrel?	41a. No quarrels 41b. Often 41c. Occasionally
42. Does family own car?	42a. Yes; permits youth to drive 42b. Yes; doesn't permit youth to drive 42c. Doesn't own car
43. Do parents approve of dating?	43a. Yes 43b. No
44. Consumption of alcohol (by parents) resulting in:	44a. Neglect 44b. Abuse of child 44c. Family discord 44d. None
45. Does family member pick on child?	45a. Mother 45b. Father 45c. Both parents 45d. Other member 45e. No member
46. Age of boy.	46a. Ten years 46b. Eleven 46c. Twelve 46d. Thirteen 46e. Fourteen
47. Race	47a. White 47b. Negro 47c. Indian 47d. Chinese
48. Creed.	48a. Protestant 48b. Catholic 48c. Jewish 48d. None 48e. Others

A number of studies had previously been made with data gathered through this system of records. These had yielded statistically significant associations with various facets of delinquency, and had also proved the data to have reliable predictive capacity.

In the present studies, for each item in the list above a table was prepared, in the form illustrated below, and each was tested by the chi-square technique to determine at what level of significance, if any, the null hypothesis could be rejected.

SAMPLE TABLE

Comparison of Attitudes toward School of Boys of Intelligence in Bottom Twenty Per Cent, Repeaters and Non-Repeaters.

Attitude	Number		Percentage	
	Repeaters	Non-Repeaters	Repeaters	Non-Repeaters
Likes	221	201	79.2	89.8
Dislikes	15	7	5.4	3.1
Indifferent	42	16	15.0	7.1
Hates	1	0	0.4	0.0

Chi-square =10.412
Degrees of freedom =3
P $\langle .02 \rangle$ .01

In the above case, the null hypothesis could be rejected at the .02 level of significance, and would be so reported.

As stated below, a series of comparisons was made using the above method. Each such series will be described and a list will be given of all tables for which the level of significance for rejection of the null hypothesis was .05 or better. For each such table, the statistically significant relationship is stated in the form of a sentence naming the item in the table contributing the major amounts in the chi-square total. All tables not mentioned in each list were inconclusive in that the level of significance for any association was inferior to the .05 level. By referring to the master list already presented, the reader can locate the inconclusive tables.

The key series of tabulations compared 279 boys whose mental test scores as recorded on school records, whatever test was utilized by the school, put them in the bottom quintile of the population, and whose police records

showed they became repeaters, with 224 boys similar as to mental test scores but whose police records indicated that the one contact they had in 1954 was their only one.

The following list states the item and category in which the repeaters were higher: (The number in parentheses indicates the level of confidence.)

1. Repeaters did not prefer radio or TV as a source of entertainment. (.05)
2. Repeaters expressed indifference toward school. (.02)
3. Repeaters stated their grades in school were poor or failing. (.05)
4. The parents were rated as indifferent or trying to alibi self by the interviewing officer. (.05)
5. More of the repeaters were non-white. (.02)

To gather information as to the extent to which these differences were distinctive to the groups compared, a similar procedure was utilized to compare 214 repeaters with 226 non-repeaters among boys with mental test scores placing them in the top four quintiles of the population. The following differences, significant beyond the .05 level of confidence were found:

1. Appearance of repeaters is not rated as neat and clean. (.05)
2. Repeaters lived in rooming houses or housing projects. (.05)
3. Dwellings of repeaters needed major repairs. (.05)
4. Repeater's families did not own cars. (.05)
5. More repeaters were Negro. (.01)
6. More repeaters were Protestant. (.02)

To complete the tetrad, comparisons were also made for both repeaters and non-repeaters between the high and low mental test score boys. In the case of non-repeaters, those in the lower quintile differed from those in the upper four quintiles on the following, with significance beyond the .05 level of confidence:

1. More of the low group were in early adolescence, less than 12 years of age. (.05)
2. More of the low group belonged to no organized youth group. (.02)
3. More of the low group had less recreational equipment than their classmates. (.05)
4. More of the low group lived in rented housing. (.01)
5. More of the low group lived in dwellings needing major repairs. (.05)
6. More of the low group lived in racially mixed neighborhoods. (.05)
7. More of the low group came from homes where neither parent was employed. (.05)
8. More of the low group came from families where the income was rated as inadequate. (.01)
9. More of the low group came from broken homes. (.02)
10. More of the low group came from families which did not own a car. (.001)
11. More of the low group were non-whites. (.001)
12. More of the low group were Protestant. (.001)

The final comparison in the series of four involved the repeaters, and compared the boys in the bottom quintile of mental test scores with those in the top four quintiles for population as a whole. The differences having a statistical significance at the .05 level of confidence were:

1. In expressing attitudes toward parents, more boys in the low group made no mention of fathers. (.02)
2. Fewer boys in low group received allowances. (.05)
3. More boys in low group lived in neighborhoods classed as slums. (.05)
4. More boys in low group had parents not rated by police as cooperative. (.02)
5. More boys in low group had fathers absent at night. (.05)
6. More boys in low group came from families which did not own a car. (.01)
7. More boys in low group were non-white. (.001)
8. More boys in low group were Protestant. (.001)

The fact that socio-economic variables were strongly present in three of the series of comparisons but not in the one in which we were most interested,--the comparison of repeaters with non-repeaters among boys in the lowest quintile on mental test scores,--gave rise to the suspicion that the boys with the low mental test scores were so heavily concentrated in areas of low socio-economic status that these factors, in effect, had been partialled out. To check on this, a fifth series of comparisons was made on the basis of area of residence. The city of Detroit is divided for planning purposes into 48 communities. The 473 boys who lived in census tracts found in the nine sub-communities where the average family income was lowest were compared with the 499 boys living in all others. On this basis, the following differences characterized boys from poor areas at the .05 level of confidence:

1. More boys from poor areas showed low mental ability. (.001)
2. More boys from poor areas expressed positive feelings concerning their homes. (.05)
3. More boys from poor areas were rated as mature. (.05)
4. More boys from poor areas were rated as slovenly in appearance. (.001)
5. More boys from poor areas were rated as mischievous. (.01)
6. More boys from poor areas expressed divided feelings concerning their parents. (.001)
7. More boys from poor areas belonged to no organized youth group. (.001)
8. More boys from poor areas preferred sports or public recreation for entertainment. (.05)
9. More boys from poor areas disliked school. (.02)
10. More boys from poor areas reported receiving good grades in school. (.05)
11. Fewer boys from poor areas had regular part-time jobs. (.01)
12. Fewer boys from poor areas had chores to do around their homes. (.001)
13. Fewer boys from poor areas received allowances. (.001)
14. More of the boys from poor areas belonged to loosely knit crowds. (.001)
15. More boys from poor areas lived in rented quarters. (.001)
16. More boys from poor areas lived in dwelling units having less than one room per person. (.001)

17. More boys from poor areas lived in dwellings where the interior was rated as slovenly. (.001)
18. More boys from poor areas lived in dwellings which was substandard or needed repairs. (.001)
19. More boys from poor areas lived in neighborhoods rated by police officers as below average. (.001)
20. More boys from poor areas lived in racially mixed neighborhoods. (.001)
21. More boys from poor areas had both parents unemployed. (.001)
22. More boys from poor areas received no supervision by their fathers. (.001)
23. More boys from poor areas came from homes where the family income was rated as inadequate. (.001)
24. More boys from poor areas came from broken homes. (.001)
25. More boys from poor areas came from families which did not own a car. (.001)
26. The parents of more boys from poor areas approved of their dating. (.001)
27. More boys from poor areas were non-white. (.001)
28. More boys from poor areas were Protestant. (.001)

A comparison of the above list with the key pattern of differences between repeaters and non-repeaters among boys in the lowest population quintile on mental test scores offers rather clear assurance that, with the exception of the item on race, there is no contamination with socio-economic phenomena. The pattern linked to repeating is one typified by preference for social rather than solitary pursuit of entertainment, an indifference toward school coupled with expression of poor work there, and having parents unable to impress police officers with their ability to cooperate in plans for dealing with their sons. The picture tends to be that of rather inadequate sons of inadequate parents, a lack of inner resources.

An important point here has to do with whether the poor grades were a reality or whether the reporting of them was an expression of attitude. To secure a clue in this respect, another series of comparisons was made: This time we segregated the records of all boys for whom objective achievement test scores showed a retardation of at least one year on both reading and arithmetic, and then compared the 192 repeaters with the 124 non-repeaters. As indicated below, the list of differences significant at the .05 level of confidence is dissimilar from that reported above:

1. The repeaters were younger. (.05)
2. The parents of the repeaters were more likely to be rated as forgiving in respect to their sons. (.01)

PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL EXPERIENCES

The second phase of the research program was based on interviews of 50 selected boys and their teachers, and represented an attempt to see what relation, if any, there was between the repeating and the perceptions. The boys consisted of 25 matched pairs. One boy in each pair was a repeater and

one a non-repeater. In one case a boy whose records indicated he was a non-repeater disclosed information that he should have been classified as a repeater, and his classification was changed. The pairs were matched on the extent of their similarity to the pattern of repeaters with low mental ability. That is, for instance, each repeater reporting poor grades was matched with a non-repeater likewise reporting poor grades. The interviews with boys still in school were conducted in a school office, the others were interviewed (and paid for their expenses) in an office at Wayne State University, except for three boys found in institutions, who were interviewed in an office at each institution.

Once the boy had been located, the teacher who had had him in 1954 was found and interviewed.

In interviewing the boy, it was explained that we were interested in what "kids" remember about school and what they think about "some of the things" in school. They were assured that anything they might say to the interviewer would be kept confidential. The interview schedule next called for the interviewer to remind the boy of the name of the school and the grade he had been in "four years ago." The questioning then proceeded as follows:

1. What did you think of school then? How did you get along in school?

2. Do you remember your teacher then? Wasn't (name of teacher to be supplied by interviewer) your homeroom teacher? Can you tell me about her (him)? (Interviewer would elicit information as to attitudes, specific incidents, methods of discipline, etc.)

3. What about your other teachers? Did you have any you especially liked or disliked? Why?

4. What were your best subjects? Why?

5. What subjects didn't you like? Why?

6. How did you get along in reading? (Interviewer would seek to elicit information as to specifics. If the boy reported difficulties, information was secured as to length of time, special help, etc.)

7. How about arithmetic? (Same line of questioning.)

8. What kids in class did you like best?

9. What did you like about them?

10. Were there any kids in class you had trouble with? What kind of trouble?

11. Were there any teachers you had trouble with? What kind of trouble?

12. What did teachers do to the kids who acted up in class? What did you think of that?

13. What do you think is the best way to handle kids who act up?

14. Were there any teachers who tried to help you do better in school? Can you tell me about it?

15. (Asked only if boy had been a visiting teacher case.) You remember (interviewer to supply name of visiting teacher), the visiting teacher. How did you like her? Do you think she helped you? Can you tell me about it?

16. We're interested in what teachers do when kids get in trouble with the police. You may remember that back in 1954 you were picked up for (interviewer to supply charge made for first offense in 1954). Do you remember whether the teacher or anyone at school heard about it?

17. Did they act differently?

18. What could they have done that might have been better?

19. Do you think it's a good idea for teachers to know about it when kids get in trouble with the police? Why?

20. What do you think about school now? (Or what did you think of school in your last year?)

21. How do you think we could make school better?

22. What did your family think about your being caught by the police? What did they do?

23. How did they punish you? How did you feel about that? Fair or unfair? How does your family discipline you? Fair or unfair?

24. What do you think is the best way to help kids stay out of trouble?

25. What about the policemen who picked you up?

After this interview was completed, the interviewer gave the boy an incomplete sentences test. This was introduced with the following instructions: "We're going to switch to something else. I say some words, you finish the sentence with whatever pops into your head. For example, if I say: My name is _____, you would finish by saying (boy supplies own name).

The following items composed this test:

1. Few boys like
2. Teachers are
3. When I go to bed
4. My mother
5. People are praised when
6. My brothers and sisters
7. The funniest thing

8. Most kids in school
9. When I go home
10. It is easy to get in trouble when
11. When I read
12. Few boys fear
13. The principal usually
14. People are blamed when
15. Home is
16. The fellows in my class
17. The worst school punishment is
18. Mothers are most liable to
19. The hardest school work
20. People are good only because
21. The most unfair teacher was the one who
22. My father
23. After school
24. Boys are usually certain that
25. Failure may be expected when
26. Policemen usually
27. Doing arithmetic
28. Boys are most annoying when
29. When I went to school I hoped
30. Television is
31. When I take a test
32. People shouldn't
33. School is
34. When I play ball
35. When I take a test
36. Boys are least annoying
37. The worst punishment at home
38. My marks were
39. Other people
40. The nicest thing that happened in school
41. Parents should learn that
42. If I were a school superintendent, I would
43. I am ashamed
44. I have fun when
45. I like a teacher who
46. My greatest ambition
47. The five things I like best about myself:
    a.
    b.
    c.
    d.
    e.
48. The five things I like least about myself:
    a.
    b.
    c.
    d.
    e.

The interview with the teachers was introduced with a short explanation of the project. To protect the boys, the teachers were told we were gathering information about one group of boys who had been in trouble and one who were not delinquent. It was stated that the boy about whom we wanted information was as likely to be in the control group as in the police-contact group. The following interview schedule was then followed:

1. Do you remember (interviewer to supply name of boy)?

2. He was in (interviewer to supply grade) in (interviewer to supply name of school) in 1954. Can you tell me about him? What was he like? (Interviewer to elicit information as to behavior, physical appearance, disposition, and attitude toward school, teachers, and fellow-pupils.)

3. Any particularly typical incidents?

4. How do you feel about him?

5. Please review his academic achievements.
   Reading?
   Arithmetic?
   Attendance?
   What might have been the source of any difficulties?

6. Did you attempt any special help? What? Any success?

7. Did you make any special efforts to win his friendship? How did you discipline him?

8. How often was he sent to the office? Who dealt with him?

9. What was his attitude toward correction or discipline? What effect did it have on him?

10. Were there any home contacts made? What was the reaction?

11. What was his family like? Did you meet them at PTA or open houses?

12. (Interviewer would open conversation about this type of boy in general.)

13. How can teachers and schools help prevent delinquency?

14. In working with this type of boy what do you see that makes it particularly difficult for you to work with him? What changes could you suggest that would make it easier for the teacher to work with this type of boy?

Processing of interview data. As a first step in dealing with the data, the interviewer made a global rating of the interviews with the boys and with the teachers. A three-point scale was utilized, the school experience was categorized as positive, mental, or negative. Then a series of tabulations was prepared. For each tabulation, the chi-square test was used to determine the level of significance at which the null hypothesis could be rejected.

The following is the list of tabulations:

1. Boys'answers to question as to how they got along in school. (Positive, negative, non-committal)
2. Boys' answers as to whether they had trouble with teachers (Yes, no.)
3. Boys' answers as to whether they had trouble with classmates. (Yes, no.)
4. Boys' present reactions to school. (Positive, negative, non-committal)
5. Boys' mention of other teachers. (Positive, negative, mixed.)
6. Boys' attitude toward homeroom teacher. (Liked, disliked, neutral.)
7. Boys' listing of worst subject.
8. Boys' listing of best subject.
9. Boys' reaction to classmates. (Positive, negative, neutral)
10. Boys' reaction to mathematics. (Positive, negative, not mentioned)
11. Boys' reactions to reading. (Positive, negative, not mentioned)
12. Boys' appraisal of arithmetic achievement. (Trouble, no trouble)
13. Boys' appraisal of reading achievement. (Trouble, no trouble)
14. Boys' mention of spelling as source of trouble. (Yes, no)
15. According to boy, did school hear of his 1954 police contact? (Yes, no, doesn't know)
16. Did boy mention any teacher who tried to help him? (Yes, no)
17. Did boy think it was a good idea for school to learn when boy had police contact? (Yes, no)
18. Rating of replies (positive or negative) to the school related items (2, 8, 13, 16, 27, 29, 31, 33, 42) on the incomplete sentences test. (total of positive responses.)
19. Number of times school was mentioned on positive items in incomplete sentences test. (5, 12, 24, 44)
20. Number of times school was mentioned on negative items in incomplete sentences test. (1, 10, 14, 25, 43)

21. Number of items related to school in the "best liked about self" question.

22. Number of items related to school in the "least liked about self" question.

23. Interviewer's subjective global rating of boys' perception of school experience. (Positive, negative, neutral)

24. Interviewer's subjective global rating of teachers' perception of boy's school experience. (Positive, negative, neutral)

25. Teacher's perceptions of boys' reaction to correction or discipline. (accepting or not resentful versus resentful or not accepting)

26. Did teacher say boy was sent to office? (Yes, no)

27. Did teacher report home contact? (Yes, no)

28. Did teacher report giving boy special help? (Yes, no)

29. Did teacher report making a special effort to win boy's friendship? (Yes, no)

30. Teacher's appraisal of boy's arithmetic achievement. (Good, poor, medium)

31. Teacher's appraisal of boy's reading achievement. (Good, poor, medium)

32. Teacher's appraisal of boy's attendance record. (Good, poor, medium)

33. Nature of "typical incidents" reported by teachers. (None, favorable, unfavorable-scholastic, unfavorable-disciplinary)

34. Nature of teacher's expressed feelings about boy. (None, antagonistic, pity, liked)

35. Did teacher recall boy? (Yes, no)

Findings. Of the 35 tabulations, nine provided chi-square results warranting rejection of the null hypothesis at the five per cent level of confidence on differences between repeaters and non-repeaters. Six of these tabulations were derived from the interviews with the boys; three, from teachers. These will be presented in the following order: significant differences from boys' interviews, comments upon inconclusive tabulations based on boys' interviews, significant differences from teachers' interviews, and comments upon inconclusive tabulations based on teachers' interviews.

For those data in the interviews of the boys where ratings or specific responses could be tabulated, differences between the repeaters and

non-repeaters, significant at a five per cent level of confidence are reported below: (Number in parenthesis reports level of confidence at which null hypothesis can be rejected.)

1. Subjective ratings by the interviewer showed more negative school experiences for the repeaters. (.001)
2. More of the repeaters asserted that they got along poorly in school. (.01)
3. More of the repeaters stated they had trouble with teachers. (.01)
4. More of the repeaters reported having trouble with classmates. (.02)
5. When asked to list subjects in which they had done poorly, more repeaters volunteered, "spelling". (.02)
6. More non-repeaters had favorable present reactions to school. (.05)

Much more striking were the items which failed to yield statistically significant differences. When asked about teachers who had tried to help them, 22 non-repeaters and 23 repeaters reported having had a teacher who aided them in doing better in academic work.

A question raised in the early stages of the project implied that once teachers knew a boy was having trouble with the police, he would be treated unfairly in school. Exactly the same number of repeaters and non-repeaters (ten in each case) stated that the school had learned of their having had a police contact, and this seemed unrelated to repeating. When asked if they thought it a good idea for teachers to learn when boys were in trouble, twelve of the repeaters and eleven of the non-repeaters said, "Yes".

On aspects of academic work, other than spelling, surprisingly the differences between repeaters and non-repeaters were less than expected. Thirteen repeaters and twelve non-repeaters remembered having difficulty in reading. In listing worst subjects, thirteen repeaters and twelve non-repeaters mentioned subjects involving language arts; five repeaters and six non-repeaters, mathematics. Ten repeaters and eight non-repeaters reported trouble in arithmetic. When listing their best subjects, twelve repeaters and thirteen non-repeaters mentioned mathematics; four repeaters and seven non-repeaters, language arts.

In talking about specific teachers, four each of both repeaters and non-repeaters indicated dislike of the homeroom teacher they had in 1954. When asked to talk about teachers they especially liked or disliked, seven of the repeaters but only four of the non-repeaters chose to dwell upon bad experiences. The results of the incomplete sentences test were inconclusive.

The picture which emerges here is that the repeaters differed from non-repeaters principally in that their interpersonal relationships were poor. Trouble with academic work was prevalent in both groups, and with the possible exception of spelling was not a factor in determining whether or not the boy became a repeater.

Some check on accuracy of recollections was provided by the fact that the teachers and boys were interviewed separately. When these reports were compared on the over-all subjective rating of the interviewer as to the

positive or negative quality of the school experience, there was full verification of the boys' reports by the teachers for twelve each of the repeaters and non-repeaters. Three positive reports by repeaters and two by non-repeaters were contradicted by negative reports from teachers. One repeater who described a negative experience had a teacher who painted a positive picture. In the remaining cases, neither confirmation nor contradiction could be established.

When the records of the interviews with the teachers were classified, as had been done with the boys' interviews, the following differences significant at the .05 level emerged:

1. In the subjective judgment of the interviewer, more of the repeaters had negative experiences in school. (.05)
2. More of the repeaters were perceived by the teachers as not accepting or as being resentful of correction or discipline by the teachers. (.02)
3. For more of the repeaters the teachers recalled having had to send the boy to the school office because of disciplinary incidents. (.05)

As with the boys, there were some major surprises in the items where no significant differences appeared. Failure of teachers to recall the boys was reported for two of the non-repeaters and four of the repeaters. Strongly antagonistic feelings against the boy were reported for seven of the repeaters and four of the non-repeaters; feelings of affection, for seven of the repeaters and thirteen of the non-repeaters. Home contacts were made by the teachers for thirteen of the repeaters and sixteen of the non-repeaters. Special help with academic work was reported for nine of the repeaters and fourteen of the non-repeaters. Efforts to win the boy's friendship were recalled for seven of the repeaters and thirteen of the non-repeaters.

Conclusions. In the first phase of the study, the findings were suggestive of a pattern of relative incompetence linked to the delinquency of boys having low mental test scores. There is some similarity to the personality syndrome psychiatrically denoted "inadequate personality."[198]

In the second phase of the study, where we were able to probe into the experiences and attitudes of boys matched on conformity to the above pattern, the key factors were not connected markedly with academic work. In that area, the experiences of both the repeater and the non-repeaters were uniformly unsatisfactory. Teachers' records showed poor work in arithmetic for sixteen of the repeaters and fourteen of the non-repeaters; poor work in reading, for fifteen of the repeaters and fourteen of the non-repeaters. Characteristically, excessive absences were reported for seven repeaters and only one non-repeater; unfavorable disciplinary incidents for ten of the repeaters and four of the non-repeaters.

The observations of the teachers substantially confirm the results of the interviewing of the boys. Unpleasant though scholastic difficulties may be, they are a common experience among boys who earn low scores on test of mental ability. In and of itself, such difficulty in not especially prog-

nostic of delinquency. Rather, the differences between repeaters and non-repeaters are based upon failures in the realm of interpersonal relations.

An unanswered question of great importance has to do with the extent to which this failure is a reflection of personality difficulties so deep-rooted as to yield only to some form of psychiatric therapy or, by contrast, sufficiently amenable to situational determinants that extra efforts by teachers could lead to significant improvement.

If one were to think of the present study as pointing toward next steps, there are three which can be suggested:

1. Using the present pattern as a clue to serious delinquency, - low mental scores coupled with interpersonal difficulties in school, - select a group and determine to what extent it is congruent with a group selected for high delinquency risk by the Glueck Social Prediction Scale.

2. Select a group as above and make a thorough study of the psychodynamics in the course of full-scale psychotherapeutic intervention.

3. Select a second group as above and determine what change can be produced by teachers utilizing classroom-appropriate methods for aiding children in their social adjustment in school.

For many workers in the field of juvenile delinquency, the present study throws some light on the too-frequent assumption that failure in school and unfeeling attitudes by teachers are a major factor in the prevalence of delinquency in the poor socio-economic groups, especially among youngsters of low intelligence. Teachers and schools, as described by the boys themselves, come out looking rather well. Practically all boys told of friendly efforts to help them. The fact that the schools involved seem to have done rather well does not negate the possiblity that they can do even better.

William W. Wattenberg

William W. Wattenberg,
Wayne State University
Detroit 2, Michigan

April 30, 1960